

REMARKS

By the above amendment, Applicant has amended the specification to clarify the novelty of the invention.

Also Applicant has amended 11 of the 16 claims to define the inventions more particularly and distinctly so as to overcome the technical rejections and define the invention patentably over the prior art. A new claim is also provided.

The previous amendment was not filed on 5/7/05. It was filed on 9/1/04 as indicated in the communication on 5/7/05. The communication on 5/7/05 was only to confirm the earlier filing in response to Notice of Abandonment mailed by mistake. Please correct the record if it is consistent with the statement in the Office Action.

The Specification Objection Under 35 USC §132(a) is Overcome

The amended specification was objected under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it was said to introduce new matter by adding the statement into page 15, 1st paragraph.

The previously added statement included a typo, which probably caused misunderstanding. Applicant appreciates the careful review. The statement is now modified to merely summarize the next 3 pages in connection with the current

paragraph. A statement is added in a later paragraph also to show more clearly the connection between these paragraphs. The 2nd paragraph on page 15 gives some specific connections between these paragraphs, and the newly added statements clarify that the specification does not cover any other specific connections between these paragraphs.

Accordingly applicant submits that no new matter is introduced any more, and solicits reconsideration and allowance.

The Claims Rejection Under 35 USC §101 is Overcome

All claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 since they failed to indicate the use of computer. Applicant appreciates the constructive assistance.

As suggested, 3 new claims have been added for using computers to store the data used in the process and for suggesting the possibility of using computers to perform some or all of the steps. Applicant does not desire to require using computers for any of the steps because human intervention is potentially helpful.

Accordingly applicant submits that claims 1-20 are allowable and solicits reconsideration and allowance.

Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, applicant submits that the drawings, the specification and claims are now in proper form, and that the claims all define patentably over the prior art. Therefore he submits that this application is now in condition for allowance, which action he respectfully solicits.

Conditional Request For Constructive Assistance

Applicant has amended the specification and claims of this application so that they are proper, definite, and define novel structure which is also unobvious. If, for any reason, this application is not believed to be in full condition for allowance, applicant respectfully requests the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 706.03(d) and § 707.07(j) in order that the undersigned can place this application to allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings.

Very respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Zhe Li', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Zhe Li, Applicant

1 Argent Drive

Poughkeepsie, NY 12603

Telephone (845) 298-8342; Fax (720) 533-1988